

Appl. No. 10/602,144  
Atty. Docket No. AA591  
Amdt. Dated 06/30/05  
Reply to Office Action of 04/07/2005  
Customer No. 27752

## REMARKS

### Claim Status

Claims 1 - 10 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

All claims have been amended to correct typographical and grammatical errors.

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the tubular wall has an inner wall. Antecedent basis for this amendment is found on page 10, line 10 of the specification.

Claim 1 further has been amended to include that the tubular shaft has an outer wall. Antecedent basis for this amendment is found on page 12, lines 3-7 of the specification.

Claim 1 further has been amended to specify a lower part of the inner wall. Antecedent basis for this amendment is found on page 10, lines 23-24 of the specification.

Claim 1 further has been amended to specify a "locking ring" and a "locking protrusion ring." Antecedent basis for this amendment is found on page 11, lines 6-7.

Claim 1 further has been amended to specify "the relative rotation of said cylindrical pin to said tubular shaft and said tubular shaft to said rotation tube." Antecedent basis for this amendment is found on page 12, lines 8-10 of the specification.

Claim 2 has been amended to replace the term "nearly" with "substantially," according to the Office Action's suggestion.

Claim 3 has been amended to clarify the recurring term "protrusion" with "first locking part," "second locking part" and "third locking part." Antecedent basis for this amendment is found on page 10, lines 14-21.

Claim 4 has been amended to read "of said" container body, according to the Office Action's suggestion.

Claim 5 has been amended to read "a material stored inside said container body." Antecedent basis for this amendment is found on page 4, lines 8 - 15.

Claim 7 has been amended to delete the term "flange-shaped."

Claim 8 has been amended to read "number" instead of "No."

Applicants believe these amendments do not involve addition of new subject matter, and therefore entry of these amendments is respectfully requested. Applicants

Appl. No. 10/602,144  
Atty. Docket No. AA591  
Amdt. Dated 06/30/05  
Reply to Office Action of 04/07/2005  
Customer No. 27752

further believe that with the above amendments, the Office Action's objections are overcome.

Rejection Under 35 USC §112, First Paragraph

Applicants further believe that with the above amendments, the Office Action's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph is overcome.

On page 10, line 10 of the specification, Applicants state "the inner wall of tubular wall 2 of the lower part of bottom wall 3 ...". Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the tubular wall has an inner wall, which serves as antecedent basis for this term in Claims 1-10.

On page 10, lines 23-24 of the specification, Applicants refer to "the lower part of the inner wall," which serves as antecedent basis to amend the term "the lower inner wall."

On page 11, lines 6-7 of the specification, Applicants refer to "a locking ring 9 which locks to [the] locking protrusion ring 6 of [the] tubular shaft." Claim 1 has been amended to delete the term "protrusion" from the first reference to a "locking protrusion ring," and believe that this resolves the ambiguity of the two instances of this term.

Applicants further have clarified the terms "axle" and "shaft" in Claim 1 on the basis of page 12, lines 8 - 10 of the specification.

On page 10, lines 14-21, Applicants discuss the small cylinder 5 standing upward with "three locking parts 4 (4a, 4b, 4c) in the inner wall which establish the rotational limit of [the] lid body." Given the language of Claim 3, Applicants believe that the term "protrusion" correlates to these three locking parts, and that this amendment adds no new subject matter.

Claim 5 has been amended to read "a material stored inside said container body," and believe that this amendment addresses the asserted lack of antecedent basis.

Finally, Applicants have deleted the term "flange shaped" from Claim 7.

Appl. No. 10/602,144  
Atty. Docket No. AA591  
Amdt. Dated 06/30/05  
Reply to Office Action of 04/07/2005  
Customer No. 27752

In summary, Applicants regret the presence of these grammatical and other errors. An effort has been made to correct not only those errors pointed out in the Office Action, but also other errors that have been found to exist.


Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 1 - 10 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By   
Juliet A. Jones  
Registration No. 54,202  
(513) 626-2127

June 30, 2005

Customer No. 27752